1	Steve Salvador Ybarra	
2	Pro Se Litigant	DEOEN/ED
3	Minnesota California	RECEIVED
4	Theory Werkx.com	MAY 1 3 2025
5	Tel: 612.544.4380	CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
6	Steve@TheoryWerkx.com	MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA
7		
8		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	FOR THE DISTR	RICT OF MINNESOTA
11		
12	Steve Salvador Ybarra Self-Represented	No 0:25-cv-01948-KMM-DJF
13	Pro Se Litigant,	
14	Plaintiff,	SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE: JUDICIAL POSTURE SUMMARY REGARDING
15	v.	STATE COURT OBSTRUCTION BY JUDGE DAVID LUTZ
16	Legal Assistance of Dakota County; Sharon Jones Esq., in her Individual and	
17	Official capacities; Hon. David Lutz, in his individual and	
18	Official capacities; Hon. Tanya Obrien, in her individual and	
19	official capacities; Hon. Dannia L Edwards, in her individual	
20	and official capacities; Lydia Clemens, in her individual and	
21	official capacities; Michelle Cathleen Ybarra,	
22 23	Defendants.	
24		
25	TO THE HONORABLE COURT:	
26	Plaintiff Steve Salvador Ybarra respectfully submits this supplemental summary to	
27	document the evolving judicial posture of Defendant Judge David Lutz in Dakota County Case	
28	No. 19AV-FA-24-839. Based on the record and I was forced to hand document notes in real time	
		1
	4	

SCANNED

MAY 1 3 2025

U.S. DISTRICT COURT MPLS

Defendant Judge Lutz has maintained a posture of procedural delay, evidentiary

3

4

1

2

I. SUMMARY OF JUDICIAL OBSTRUCTION

56

suppression, and institutional protection. This conduct is not neutral judicial oversight—it is **strategic insulation**, manifesting through the following:

7 8

1. Refusal to Adjudicate Fraud:

9

 Judge Lutz stated, "I do not see a prima facie case of fraud on the court," despite multiple verified Rule 60.02(d) motions, unrebutted discovery records, and

11

transcript-supported ghostwriting admissions by Defendant Sharon Jones

12

No evidentiary hearing has been held, nor has the court permitted discovery into the sealed fee affidavits or Legal Aid eligibility documents.

1314

2. Denial of Subject Matter Jurisdiction Challenge:

15

16

When Plaintiff raised non-waivable jurisdictional defects under the UCCJEA,
 Judge Lutz dismissed them as waived by counter-petition, contradicting binding

17

state and federal precedent. (See H.M.B. v. E.T.M., A21-1174, 2022 WL 897216).

18

3. Canon 2.11 Conflict Ignored:

19 20

Assistance of Dakota County, a named defendant in this case. He declined to

Judge Lutz admitted on record to handling six family law cases for Legal

21

recuse and instead directed Plaintiff to raise the issue with Chief Judge Kerry

22

Lennon.

4. Denial of Timely Rulings as Tactical Delay:

2324

Judge Lutz stated his order addressing all of Plaintiff's motions exceeds 40 pages
 and will be issued after all hearings conclude, possibly 90 days post-argument.

25

This is a deliberate postponement designed to frustrate federal review and exhaust

26

Plaintiff's financial and constitutional position while creating the false appearance

2728

of procedural fairness.

2

1	5. Optical Fairness with No Substantive Adjudication:	
2	o The court permits Plaintiff to "argue" motions but has refused to rule on any issue	
3	tied to fraud, sealed discovery, or judicial conflict—while denying multiple	
4	motions on the record without factual findings.	
5		
6	II. IMPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL OVERSIGHT	
7	This posture satisfies the extraordinary circumstances exception under Younger v. Harris,	
8	401 U.S. 37 (1971), and warrants federal intervention under <i>Pulliam v. Allen</i> , 466 U.S. 522	
9	(1984). The continued participation of a judge who is:	
10	A named federal defendant;	
11	A fact witness to prior Legal Aid affiliations;	
12	Refusing to recuse;	
13	Denying due process without hearing;	
14	And delaying rulings until post-litigation exhaustion—	
15	represents a structural breakdown of neutral adjudication.	
16	Plaintiff submits this posture summary for the record in support of all pending federal	
17	motions, including:	
18	Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for TRO and Preliminary Injunction;	
19	Plaintiff's Motion for Financial Relief;	
20	Plaintiff's Motion for Rule 11 Sanctions;	
21	Plaintiff's Emergency Notice of Outstanding Discovery Obstruction;	
22	And any future request for default, in-camera review, or declaratory relief.	
23	Respectfully submitted,	
24	Dated: May 13, 2025	
25	/s/ Steve Salvador Ybarra	
26	Steve Salvador Ybarra	
27	Pro Se Plaintiff	
28	Email: Steve@TheoryWerkx.com	
	3	

Tel: (612) 544-4380 1 2 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 3 I hereby certify that on May 12, 2025, I served a true and correct copy of the attached: 4 SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE: JUDICIAL POSTURE SUMMARY REGARDING 5 STATE COURT OBSTRUCTION BY JUDGE DAVID LUTZ 6 upon the following parties by email and/or U.S. Mail: 7 **Legal Assistance of Dakota County** 8 Email: admin@dakotalegal.org 9 Sharon Jones, Esq., in her individual and official capacities 10 Legal Assistance of Dakota County 11 Email: sjones@dakotalegal.org 12 Hon. David Lutz, in his individual and official capacities 13 **Dakota County District Court** 14 1560 Highway 55, Hastings, MN 55033 15 Email: Raymond.mestad@courts.state.mn.us 16 Hon. Tanya O'Brien, in her individual and official capacities 17 **Dakota County District Court** 18 1560 Highway 55, Hastings, MN 55033 19 Email: 20 Hon. Dannia L. Edwards, in her individual and official capacities 21 **Dakota County District Court** 22 1560 Highway 55, Hastings, MN 55033 23 Email: 24 Lydia Clemens, Guardian ad Litem, in her individual and official capacities 25 First Judicial District GAL Program 26 Email: Lydia.clemens@courts.state.mn.us 27 Michelle Cathleen Ybarra, Respondent 28

Email: shellbel1@hotmail.com This notice was served to all named parties via email where available and U.S. Mail where necessary, consistent with Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b) and Local Rule 7.1. Respectfully submitted, /s/ Steve Salvador Ybarra Pro Se Litigant Steve@TheoryWerkx.com (612) 544-4380 Executed May 12, 2025